

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

106th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 113

May 13, 1999, 9:48 a.m.
Page S-5194 Temp. Record

JUVENILE JUSTICE/Internet Filters and Screening Software

SUBJECT: Violent and Repeat Juvenile Offender Accountability and Rehabilitation Act of 1999 . . . S. 254.
Hatch/Leahy amendment No. 335.

ACTION: AMENDMENT AGREED TO, 100-0

SYNOPSIS: As introduced, S. 254, the Violent and Repeat Juvenile Offender Accountability and Rehabilitation Act of 1999, will modernize Federal grant programs that give aid to State and local governments for juvenile law enforcement and juvenile crime prevention efforts. Approximately \$1 billion per year for the next 5 years will be authorized for those grant programs. Also, \$100 million annually will be authorized for joint Federal-State-local efforts to address gang-related juvenile crime.

The Hatch/Leahy amendment would require internet service providers to offer to residential customers, for free or at cost, computer software or other filtering devices that the customers could use to prevent the access of minors to material on the Internet. Surveys would be conducted 1 year, 2 years, and 3 years after enactment of this Act to determine the percentage of residential customers who were being given access to screening devices by their internet service providers. The requirement that such devices be provided for free or at cost would only take effect if fewer than 75 percent of customers in the first year, 85 percent of customers in the second year, or 100 percent of customers in the third year were not being provided filtering devices for free or at cost.

Those favoring the amendment contended:

This amendment is largely intended to protect children from violent and obscene internet material by requiring internet service providers to give parents the tools they need to protect their children from such material. The largest internet service provider already provides such a screening device as part of its basic service. We do not think it is too much to ask to make other providers follow suit. In fact, we believe they will do so even without this amendment in response to consumer demand. We are confident that the amendment is constitutional because it makes no distinction based on content. Parents would decide what type of material they

(See other side)

YEAS (100)			NAYS (0)		NOT VOTING (0)	
Republican (55 or 100%)	Democrats (45 or 100%)		Republicans (0 or 0%)	Democrats (0 or 0%)	Republicans (0)	Democrats (0)
Abraham	Hutchinson	Akaka	Kennedy			
Allard	Hutchison	Baucus	Kerrey			
Ashcroft	Inhofe	Bayh	Kerry			
Bennett	Jeffords	Biden	Kohl			
Bond	Kyl	Bingaman	Landrieu			
Brownback	Lott	Boxer	Lautenberg			
Bunning	Lugar	Breaux	Leahy			
Burns	Mack	Bryan	Levin			
Campbell	McCain	Byrd	Lieberman			
Chafee	McConnell	Cleland	Lincoln			
Cochran	Murkowski	Conrad	Mikulski			
Collins	Nickles	Daschle	Moynihan			
Coverdell	Roberts	Dodd	Murray			
Craig	Roth	Dorgan	Reed			
Crapo	Santorum	Durbin	Reid			
DeWine	Sessions	Edwards	Robb			
Domenici	Shelby	Feingold	Rockefeller			
Enzi	Smith, Bob	Feinstein	Sarbanes			
Fitzgerald	Smith, Gordon	Graham	Schumer			
Frist	Snowe	Harkin	Torricelli			
Gorton	Specter	Hollings	Wellstone			
Gramm	Stevens	Inouye	Wyden			
Grams	Thomas	Johnson				
Grassley	Thompson					
Gregg	Thurmond					
Hagel	Voinovich					
Hatch	Warner					
Helms						

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

Compiled and written by the staff of the Republican Policy Committee—Larry E. Craig, Chairman

wanted to screen. They might block violent or obscene sites; they might block commercial sites; they might block sites that advocated a certain point of view. It would be up to the parents. We urge our colleagues to accept this amendment.

No arguments were expressed in opposition to the amendment.

VOTE NO.
